

REMARKS

Claims 1, 17, 22 and 31 are amended. Claims 1-34 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite as it is unclear, in the Office's view, whether these claims are directed to storage mediums, computer systems or method claims because they depend on a method claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, consider claim 29 reproduced just below:

29. A *storage medium* comprising a plurality of executable instructions which, when executed, implement a method according to claim 22.

This claim is very clearly and unmistakably directed to a *storage medium* that comprises instructions that implement the method of claim 22. Thus, this claim is not a *method* claim. This claim is known as a dependent Beauregard claim which is a widely used and accepted form of claim.

In addition, the Patent Office has approved of this type of claim as evidenced by the large number of patents that have been granted which include dependent Beauregard claims. As an example, the Office is respectfully directed to the following patents and their associated claims:

- U.S. Patent No. 6,738,666 – claim 12
- U.S. Patent No. 6,738,512 – claim 34

- U.S. Patent No. 6,725,262 – claim 33

**U.S. Patent No. 6,738,666 – claim 12**

With regards to the '666 patent, consider claim 12 which depends from claim 1, each of which is produced below:

1. A method comprising:

determining a position parameter indicative of a change in a patient's position;

determining a cross-check parameter affected at least in part by the change in the patient's position; and

selectively administering pacing therapy to the patient based on the position parameter and the cross-check parameter.

12. One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a programmable stimulation device, cause the stimulation device to execute the method of claim 1.

Applicants notes that the independent claim is a method claim and dependent claim 12 is a computer-readable media claim.

**U.S. Patent No. 6,738,512 – claim 34**

With regards to the '512 patent consider claim 34 which depends from claim 21, each of which is produced below:

21. A method comprising:

receiving an image;

identifying edges in the image;

identifying, based on the identified edges, candidate text areas which may contain shapes; and

removing, from the candidate text areas, edges which are not recognized as characteristic of one or more shapes.

1 34. One or more computer-readable memories containing a computer  
2 program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in  
3 claim 21.

4 Applicant notes that claim 21 is a method claim and dependent claim 34 is  
5 a computer-readable media claim.

6 **U.S. Patent No. 6,725,262 – claim 33**

7 With regards to the '262 patent, consider claim 33 which depends from  
8 claim 26, each of which is reproduced below:  
9

10 26. A computer-implemented method of synchronizing a configuration of  
11 resources on a plurality of computing devices comprising:  
12 generating a set of lists that describes a configuration of resources  
13 that each of a plurality of computing devices should have in order to be  
14 synchronized with one another, the configuration of resources defining the  
15 content and the settings for each of the computing devices;  
16 sending the set of lists to each of the computing devices;  
17 receiving a response from one or more of the computing devices,  
18 each response requesting data that is needed in order to synchronize the  
19 configuration of resources for the corresponding computing device;  
20 evaluating the response to determine what data is needed by a  
21 particular computing device to synchronize its resources; and  
22 sending the data that is needed by the particular computing device to  
23 the computing device so that it can synchronize its resources.

24 33. One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable  
25 instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, implement the  
method of claim 26.

Applicant notes that claim 26 is a method claim and dependent claim 33 is  
a computer-readable media claim.

Applicant has reviewed the MPEP and Title 37 of the CFR and can find no  
proscription against writing claims in the manner of Applicant's claims 29 and 30.

Moreover, the Office has issued a plethora of patents having claims written in the same or similar form as Applicant's claims 29 and 30. The three cited issued patents above indicate but a few of these patents.

Applicant respectfully submits that requiring these claims to be rewritten in independent form is inconsistent with what is a widely accepted practice, and one which is condoned by the Office as evidenced by the plethora of issued patents having claims written in this form.

If the Office continues to disagree with this position, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to cite to an authority that specifically proscribes the claim format that Applicant has chosen to use.

Short of an authority that is specifically on point, Applicant very respectfully declines to amend the claims as requested by the Office.

#### **35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 Rejections**

Claims 1-10, 12-18, 20-25 and 27-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,913,038 to Griffiths.

Claims 11, 19 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Griffiths in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,935 to Payton.

#### **The Claims**

Claim 1 has been amended and recites a system comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- a plurality of sources; and
- an interface, selectively coupled to the plurality of sources, to generate and implement a development project of processing chains at least one chain of which comprises multiple filters, wherein the

interface loads a processing chain for each of the plurality of media sources at a point during the execution of the project when the chain is required, and wherein the interface is configured to unload at least a subset of the chains when they are not required, *wherein unloading of said subset is accomplished based, at least in part, on a generated execution list comprising:*

- *a chain identifier field which maintains a list of chains utilized in the project;*
- *a source identifier field which contains information denoting a project source;*
- *a project time field which denotes at what point during the project execution of a source chain is required;*
- *a source time field which denotes what portion of a source file is required; and*
- *a dependencies field which denotes whether an associated chain is dependent on any other chains.*

Support for this amendment can be found in the Specification from page 53, line 1 through page 54, line 14.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Griffiths anticipates this claim and cites to various sections in support thereof. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended this claim as indicated above. Applicant has reviewed Griffiths and can find nothing that discloses or suggests the subject matter of this claim, as amended.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, Griffiths does not anticipate this claim and it is allowable.

**Claims 2-16** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. In addition, as Griffiths does not anticipate claim 1, the Office's further reliance on Payton in making out the rejection of claim 11 is not seen to add anything of significance.

1 Claim 17 has been amended and recites a computer-implemented method  
2 for generating and managing a development project comprising [added language  
3 appears in bold italics]:

- 4 • identifying processing chains required to support execution of the  
5 development project over the next M seconds;
- 6 • loading the identified processing chains as long as a currently loaded  
7 chain-count does not exceed an initial threshold, T, wherein T and M  
8 are greater than 0; and
- 9 • *unloading a subset of loaded processing chains based, at least in  
10 part, on a generated execution list comprising:*
  - 11 ○ *a chain identifier field which maintains a list of chains*  
12 *utilized in the project;*
  - 13 ○ *a source identifier field which contains information*  
14 *denoting a project source;*
  - 15 ○ *a project time field which denotes at what point during the*  
16 *project execution of a source chain is required;*
  - 17 ○ *a source time field which denotes what portion of a source*  
18 *file is required; and*
  - 19 ○ *a dependencies field which denotes whether an associated*  
20 *chain is dependent on any other chains.*

21 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Griffiths  
22 anticipates this claim and cites to various sections in support thereof. Applicant  
23 respectfully disagrees. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended this claim as  
24 indicated above. Applicant has reviewed Griffiths and can find nothing that  
25 discloses or suggests the subject matter of this claim, as amended.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, Griffiths does not anticipate this claim  
and it is allowable.

Claims 18-21 depend from claim 17 and are allowable as depending from  
an allowable base claim. In addition, as Griffiths does not anticipate claim 17, the

Office's further reliance on Payton in making out the rejection of claim 19 is not seen to add anything of significance.

**Claim 22** has been amended and recites a computer-implemented method for managing a media processing project comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- identifying each of a plurality of sources required to satisfy the media processing project;
- determining when one or more chain(s) associated with each of the plurality of sources is required to support execution of the media processing project; and
- selectively loading and unloading each of the chains during execution of the filter graph based, at least in part, on when each of the chains are required to support execution of the media processing project, at least some selectively loaded and unloaded chains comprising multiple filters, *wherein unloading of said chains is accomplished based, at least in part, on a generated execution list comprising:*
  - *a chain identifier field which maintains a list of chains utilized in the project;*
  - *a source identifier field which contains information denoting a project source;*
  - *a project time field which denotes at what point during the project execution of a source chain is required;*
  - *a source time field which denotes what portion of a source file is required; and*
  - *a dependencies field which denotes whether an associated chain is dependent on any other chains.*

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Griffiths anticipates this claim and cites to various sections in support thereof. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended this claim as indicated above. Applicant has reviewed Griffiths and can find nothing that discloses or suggests the subject matter of this claim, as amended.

1 Accordingly, for at least this reason, Griffiths does not anticipate this claim  
2 and it is allowable.

3 **Claims 23-30** depend from claim 22 and are allowable as depending from  
4 an allowable base claim. In addition, as Griffiths does not anticipate claim 22, the  
5 Office's further reliance on Payton in making out the rejection of claim 26 is not  
6 seen to add anything of significance.

7 **Claim 31** has been amended and recites A storage medium comprising a  
8 plurality of executable instructions which, when executed, implements an interface  
9 to manage development and execution of a development project, wherein the  
10 interface identifies processing chains required to support execution of the  
11 development project over the next M seconds, and loads the identified processing  
12 chains as long as a currently loaded chain-count does not exceed an initial  
13 threshold, T, wherein M and T are greater than 0, *and wherein the interface*  
14 *unloads chains based, at least in part, on a generated execution list comprising:*  
15 *a chain identifier field which maintains a list of chains utilized in the project; a*  
16 *source identifier field which contains information denoting a project source; a*  
17 *project time field which denotes at what point during the project execution of a*  
18 *source chain is required; a source time field which denotes what portion of a*  
19 *source file is required; and a dependencies field which denotes whether an*  
20 *associated chain is dependent on any other chains.*

21 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Griffiths  
22 anticipates this claim and cites to various sections in support thereof. Applicant  
23 respectfully disagrees. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended this claim as  
24 indicated above. Applicant has reviewed Griffiths and can find nothing that  
25 discloses or suggests the subject matter of this claim, as amended.



1 Accordingly, for at least this reason, Griffiths does not anticipate this claim  
2 and it is allowable.

3 Claims 32-34 depend from claim 31 and are allowable as depending from  
4 an allowable base claim.

5 **Conclusion**

6  
7 Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are in condition for  
8 allowance and Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowability be issued  
9 forthwith. If the next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a  
10 Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the  
11 purpose of scheduling an interview.  
12  
13

14 Respectfully Submitted,

15  
16 Dated: 2/11/05

By: 

Lance R. Sadler  
Reg. No. 38,605  
(509) 324-9256